

### REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

#### Claim amendments/Status

Claims 1-10 remain un-amended in this application.

#### Drawings

The objections to the drawings are not understood. It appears that the term "Figure 2" *per se* is alleged not found in the specification. In traverse, attention is called to paragraph [0023] of United States Patent Application publication No. 20070168920. As to the need for Figs. 1-4 to be labeled, Applicant submits that the drawings are self-explanatory to a person of skill in the art when taken with the written disclosure, and that the need for additional "labeling" is not necessary.

#### Rejections under 35 USC § 102

The rejection of claims 1, 2 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Mackinnon ("Designing UML Diagrams for Technical Documentation"), is respectfully traversed.

It has been found that the word "requirement" occurs only once in MacKinnon (page 105, right column, 5<sup>th</sup> line from bottom) and that the figures of this reference do not show any "requirement." More especially, § 3.3.1 discloses merely basic steps necessary for drawing a clean UML diagram, but does not suggest using any "requirement." Therefore, Applicant does not understand how the Examiner could misunderstand this reference to the extent observed in this rejection.

#### Rejections under 35 USC § 103

1) The rejection of claims 3, 4 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mackinnon ("Designing UML Diagrams for Technical Documentation") in view of Gangopadhyay (US 6,986,145 B2);

2) the rejection of claims 5-8 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mackinnon ("Designing UML Diagrams for Technical Documentation") in view of Richard Stevens (UK 2,353,613); and

3) the rejection of claims 9, 10 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mackinnon (“Designing UML Diagrams for Technical Documentation”) in view of Gangopadhyay (US 6,986,145 B2), further view of Richard Stevens (UK 2,353,613); and respectively traversed.

Gangopadhyay, while disclosing an “Object Schema” which is “similar to conventional UML Class Relationship models” (Column 6, lines 20-21) and mentions only “Object Types and a set of navigational Relationships among these Object Types” (Col. 8, lines 17-19), i.e. mere paths between these Object Types, but not at all genuine requirements (or constraints). Furthermore, this reference, as mentioned *supra*, only mentions the word “requirements” once, however, states the disclosed invention can “automatically eliminate the data entry requirements for the services” (column 12, lines 29-34).

Applicant therefore submits that it would not make sense to combine MacKinnon (which uses a standard UML diagram) with Gangopadhyay (which uses an Object Schema and navigational relationships and excludes the requirements). Moreover, if a combination were to be considered, still one would not be lead to use any requirement.

Stevens does mention different kinds of requirements (mechanical, electrical, operational,...), but these are used either in a tree diagram or in text mode (page 3, lines 14-19) and never mentions any UML diagram. Thus, even if the hypothetical person of ordinary skill were to consider Stevens in light of Mackinnon, he/she would not be prompted to use Stevens’ requirements in MacKinnon UML diagram. Further, as can be seen from figure 2, Stevens’ requirements (30 and 32A-32C) are not at all placed on the elements (34A to 38C), but are completely distinct from them.

Therefore, no combination of these or the other cited references, suggests the claimed subject matter in any way.

To sum up, the present invention does not claim a standard requirements use, but a new way of creating two kinds of requirements in view to provide a complete requirements traceability by creating two kinds of requirements: the “downstream” requirements which are placed on each element when this element is created, and the “upstream” ones that are placed on the corresponding elements that are the origin of the created elements.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the claims as they stand before the Patent Office are allowable over the art which has been applied in this Office Action. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application are courteously solicited.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application should be in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Early issuance of a Notice of Allowance is courteously solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, Applicant's attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
**LOWE HAUPTMAN HAM & BERNER, LLP**



Kenneth M. Berner  
Registration No. 37,093

1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314  
(703) 684-1111  
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile  
**Date: September 22, 2008**  
**KMB/KT/cac**